



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/726,532	12/04/2003	Ronald Scott Bolder	ALC 3102	7943
7590 KRAMER & AMADO, P.C. Suite 240 1725 Duke Street Alexandria, VA 22314				
06/04/2008				
EXAMINER				
DAO, THUY CHAN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2192				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/04/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/726,532

Applicant(s)

BOLDER ET AL.

Examiner

Thuy Dao

Art Unit

2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 and 28-42 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 and 28-42 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on March 28, 2008.
2. Claims 1-25 and 28-42 have been examined.

Response to Amendments

3. In the instant amendments, claims 1-3, 16, 21, 25, 30, 33-35, and 42 have been amended; claims 26-27 have been canceled.
4. The 35 USC §101 rejection over claims 16-29 is withdrawn in view of Applicants' amendments.

Claim Objections

5. In the instant amendments, claims 16, 21, and 25 have been amended to obviate the 35 USC section 101 rejection.

However, after further consideration, claims 16, 21, and 25 are objected to because of minor informalities.

Claim 16, lines 1-3 is considered to read as - -An analyst human-machine interface, embedded in a computer-readable recording medium, for communications network managed entity configuration comprising [[a computer-readable medium encoded with instructions, the computer-readable medium comprising]] means for: ...- - as similarly recited in claim 25 (a computer-readable recording medium) and consistent with claims 17-20 (directing to "the analyst human-machine interface", but not merely "a computer-readable medium").

Claim 21, lines 1-3 is considered to read as - -A managed entity configuration human-machine interface, embedded in a computer-readable recording medium, comprising [[a computer-readable medium encoded with instructions, the computer-readable medium comprising]] means for: ...- - as similarly recited in claim 25 (a computer-readable recording medium) and consistent with claims 22-24 (directing to "the managed entity configuration human-machine interface", but not merely "a computer-readable medium").

Claim 25, lines 1-2 is considered to read as - A computer-readable recording medium comprising [[a computer-readable medium encoded with instructions, the computer-readable medium comprising]]: ...- .

Furthermore, claim 30, line 9 is considered to read as -submitting the command script [[template]] to the managed entity for execution- - as previously recited in line 7.

Appropriate correction is requested.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicants' arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-25 and 28-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,785,706 to Horman (art made of record, hereafter "Horman") in view of US Patent No. 6,742,029 to Vasamsetti et al. (art made of record, hereafter "Vasamsetti") and further in view of US Patent Publication No. 2004/0268298 A1 to Miller et al. (art made of record, hereafter "Miller").

Claim 1:

Horman discloses a *script management system comprising:*

a script repository retrievably storing a plurality of parameterized command script templates (e.g., FIG. 1, col.3: 6-38; col.2: 27-49),

at least one command specification constituent of a command script template specifies a user parameter identifier (e.g., col.8: 8-34; col.3: 6-38; col.3: 53 – col.4: 57); and

managed entity configuration management module populating parameterized command script templates in deriving corresponding command scripts (e.g., col.3: 6-38; col.8: 8-34; col.25: 48 – col.28: 46); and

user parameter set are used to populate the command script templates (e.g., col.3: 53 – col.4: 57; col.2: 27-49).

Horman does not explicitly disclose a *versioning module ensuring that appropriate user parameter set are used.*

However, in an analogous art, Vasamsetti further discloses a *versioning module ensuring that appropriate user parameter set are used* (e.g., FIG. 5 Network Profile Templates, which ensure each template “Bridge”, “Static”, “WANRIP”, “BothRIP” has appropriate user parameter set associated with modes and/or features, col.8: 34 - col.9: 6; and FIG. 6, block 114, specifying appropriate user parameter set based on profile management option from block 102, col.9: 7 - col.10: 54).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Vasamsetti's teaching into Horman's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so to ensure compatibility as suggested by Vasamsetti (e.g., col.10: 30-54).

Neither Horman nor Vasamsetti explicitly discloses *versions of user parameter sets*

However, in an analogous art, Miller further discloses *versions of user parameter sets* (e.g., FIG. 15, item 1514, [0126]; [0071]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Miller's teaching into Horman and Vasamsetti's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so to provide the ownership for the user parameter set and/or identify said user parameter set as suggested by Miller (e.g., [0071]).

Claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Horman also discloses:

at least one command constituent of the command script template further specifies a user parameter identifier (e.g., col.1: 40 – col.2: 6)

entering a user parameter value for the user parameter identifier, saving the user parameter value with the script repository, optionally requesting the user parameter value from the script repository (e.g., col.2: 27-65),

optionally retrieving the user parameter value from the script repository, optionally editing the user parameter value, and optionally deleting the user parameter value (e.g., col.4: 44 – col.5: 2).

Claim 3:

The rejection of claim 2 is incorporated. Horman also discloses:

the command script template is stored in the script repository along with a command script template version identifier (e.g., col.2: 27-49; col.3: 53 – col.4: 57),

user parameter values corresponding to the at least one command specifications constituent of the command script template are stored in a user parameter set having a user parameter set version identifier (e.g., col.5: 5-56); and

the versioning module inspecting the command script template version identifier and the user parameter set version identifier to ensure correspondence there between (e.g., col.6: 18-56).

Claim 4:

The rejection of claim 3 is incorporated. Horman also discloses *requesting additional user parameter values to be entered via the managed entity configuration human-machine interface when discrepancies arise between a command script template version identifier and a user parameter set identifier* (e.g., col.7: 27-65).

Claim 5:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Horman also discloses:

at least one command constituent of the command script template further specifies a network management system parameter identifier (e.g., col.8: 56 – col.9: 48)
obtaining a corresponding managed entity parameter value from one of a network management system and an network management system database (e.g., col.10: 22-64).

Claim 6:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Horman also discloses:

each command script template further comprises an associated script execution dependency specification identifying at least one command script required to be executed in advance thereof (e.g., col.8: 8-44),

a script sequencer inspecting the script execution dependency specification of at least one command script, the command script being derived from a corresponding command script template (e.g., col.11: 27-65),

to determine whether an at least one additional command script is required to be executed in advance thereof; the submitted and the additional command scripts representing an apply list of scripts (e.g., col.25: 48 – col.28: 46),

the script execution dependency specification and the script sequencer enabling the use of specific command script templates in respect of discrete configuration tasks (e.g., col.8: 8-34),

script execution dependency specified combinations of which specifying complex communications network managed entity configurations tasks (e.g., col.3: 6-38).

Claim 7:

The rejection of claim 6 is incorporated. Horman also discloses *the script execution dependency specification further comprises a script execution dependency table* (e.g., col.3: 53 – col.4: 57).

Claim 8:

The rejection of claim 6 is incorporated. Horman also discloses *the managed communications network entity configuration management module further submitting sequenced command scripts to at least one target managed communications network entity for execution in configuring thereof* (e.g., col.2: 27-49).

Claim 9:

The rejection of claim 8 is incorporated. Horman also discloses *a managed entity configuration human-machine interface including means for: target managed entity selection, command script template selection* (e.g., col.8: 8-34; col.11: 27: 65), and *submission of the command script template selection for configuration of the at least one selected target managed entity to the managed communications network entity configuration management module* (e.g., col.3: 6-38).

Claim 10:

The rejection of claim 9 is incorporated. Horman also discloses *each target managed entity comprises one of: a router, an interface, a routing protocol, an Internet Protocol link* (e.g., col.1: 40 – col.2: 6).

Claim 11:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Horman also discloses *an analyst human-machine interface including means for: command script template creation, submission of the command script template to the script repository for storage, optional*

retrieval of the command script template, and optional modification of the command script template (e.g., col.2: 27-65; col.3: 53 - col.4: 57).

Claim 12:

The rejection of claim 11 is incorporated. Horman also discloses *parameterized command script template specification in creating thereof* (e.g., col.4: 44 – col.5: 2).

Claim 13:

The rejection of claim 11 is incorporated. Horman also discloses *command script template specification in accordance with one command interface language from:*

Command Line Interface (CLI), eXtensible Markup Language (XML) (e.g., col.6: 18-56),

Node Management Terminal Interface (NMTI), and Transaction Language 1 (TL1) (e.g., col.7: 27-65).

Claim 14:

The rejection of claim 11 is incorporated. Horman also discloses *script execution dependency specification* (e.g., col.8: 56 – col.9: 48).

Claim 15:

The rejection of claim 11 is incorporated. Horman also discloses *command script execution authorization specification in respect of the command script template* (e.g., col.10: 22-64).

Claim 16:

Horman also discloses *an analyst human-machine interface, embedded in a computer-readable recording medium, for communications network managed entity configuration comprising means for:*

command script template creation (e.g., col.2: 27-49; col.3: 53 – col.4: 57),

submission of the command script template to a script repository for storage (e.g., FIG. 1, col.3: 6-38),

optional retrieval of the command script template (e.g., col.3: 53 – col.4: 57; col.8: 8-34),

optional modification of the command script template (e.g., col.2: 27-65; col.4: 44 – col.5: 2), and

user parameter set are used to populate the command script templates (e.g., col.3: 53 – col.4: 57; col.2: 27-49).

Horman does not explicitly disclose *a versioning module ensuring that appropriate user parameter set are used.*

However, in an analogous art, Vasamsetti further discloses *a versioning module ensuring that appropriate user parameter set are used* (e.g., FIG. 5 Network Profile Templates, which ensure each template “Bridge”, “Static”, “WANRIP”, “BothRIP” has appropriate user parameter set associated with modes and/or features, col.8: 34 - col.9: 6; and FIG. 6, block 114, specifying appropriate user parameter set based on profile management option from block 102, col.9: 7 - col.10: 54).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Vasamsetti’s teaching into Horman’s teaching. One would have been motivated to do so to ensure compatibility as suggested by Vasamsetti (e.g., col.10: 30-54).

Neither Horman nor Vasamsetti explicitly discloses *versions of user parameter sets*

However, in an analogous art, Miller further discloses *versions of user parameter sets* (e.g., FIG. 15, item 1514, [0126]; [0071]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Miller’s teaching into Horman and Vasamsetti’s teaching. One would have been motivated to do so to provide the ownership for the

Art Unit: 2192

user parameter set and/or identify said user parameter set as suggested by Miller (e.g., [0071]).

Claim 17:

The rejection of claim 16 is incorporated. Horman also discloses *parameterized command script template specification in creating thereof* (e.g., col.6: 18-56).

Claim 18:

The rejection of claim 16 is incorporated. Horman also discloses *script execution dependency specification in respect of a command script template* (e.g., col.7: 27-65).

Claim 19:

The rejection of claim 16 is incorporated. Horman also discloses *command script execution authorization specification in respect of the command script template* (e.g., col.8: 56 – col.9: 48).

Claim 20:

The rejection of claim 16 is incorporated. Horman also discloses *command script template creation means provides command script template specification in accordance with one command interface language from:*

Command Line Interface (CLI), eXtensible Markup Language (XML) (e.g., col.1: 40 – col.2: 6),

Node Management Terminal Interface (NMTI), and Transaction Language 1 (TL1) (e.g., col.2: 27-65).

Claim 21:

Horman also discloses *a managed entity configuration human-machine interface, embedded in a computer-readable recording medium, comprising means for:*

command script template selection from a group of command script templates (e.g., FIG. 1, col.3: 6-38; col.2: 27-49),

submission of the command script template selection for the configuration of at least one target managed entity (e.g., col.3: 6-38; col.8: 8-34; col.3: 53 – col.4: 57), and

user parameter set are used to populate the command script templates (e.g., col.3: 53 – col.4: 57; col.2: 27-49).

Horman does not explicitly disclose *a versioning module ensuring that appropriate user parameter set are used.*

However, in an analogous art, Vasamsetti further discloses *a versioning module ensuring that appropriate user parameter set are used* (e.g., FIG. 5 Network Profile Templates, which ensure each template “Bridge”, “Static”, “WANRIP”, “BothRIP” has appropriate user parameter set associated with modes and/or features, col.8: 34 - col.9: 6; and FIG. 6, block 114, specifying appropriate user parameter set based on profile management option from block 102, col.9: 7 - col.10: 54).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Vasamsetti's teaching into Horman's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so to ensure compatibility as suggested by Vasamsetti (e.g., col.10: 30-54).

Neither Horman nor Vasamsetti explicitly discloses *versions of user parameter sets*

However, in an analogous art, Miller further discloses *versions of user parameter sets* (e.g., FIG. 15, item 1514, [0126]; [0071]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Miller's teaching into Horman and Vasamsetti's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so to provide the ownership for the user parameter set and/or identify said user parameter set as suggested by Miller (e.g., [0071]).

Claim 22:

The rejection of claim 21 is incorporated. Horman also discloses:

command script template specification is parameterized, at least one command constituent of the command script template specifies a user parameter identifier (e.g., col.4: 44 – col.5: 2),

entering a user parameter value, submitting the user parameter value for storage in a repository, optionally retrieving the user parameter value from the script repository (e.g., col.5: 5-56),

optionally editing the user parameter value, and optionally deleting the user parameter value (e.g., col.6: 18-56).

Claim 23:

The rejection of claim 21 is incorporated. Horman also discloses *target managed entity selection from a group of managed communications network entities (e.g., col.7: 27-65).*

Claim 24:

The rejection of claim 23 is incorporated. Horman also discloses *each target managed entity comprises one of: a router, an interface, a routing protocol, an Internet Protocol link (e.g., col.8: 56 – col.9: 48).*

Claim 25:

Horman also discloses *a computer-readable recording medium comprising:*

at least one parameterized command script template (e.g., col.2: 27-49);
and

a user parameter set (e.g., FIG. 1, col.3: 6-38; col.3: 53 – col.4: 57),
wherein the parameterized command script template further comprises an associated version specification (e.g., col.18; col.5: 5-56; col.7: 27-65) and
the user parameter set further comprises an associated specification (e.g., col.3: 53 - col.4: 57; col.8: 8-34; col.25: 48 - col.28: 46),

user parameter set are used to populate the command script templates (e.g., col.3: 53 – col.4: 57; col.2: 27-49).

Horman does not explicitly disclose *a versioning module ensuring that appropriate user parameter set are used.*

However, in an analogous art, Vasamsetti further discloses *a versioning module ensuring that appropriate user parameter set are used* (e.g., FIG. 5 Network Profile Templates, which ensure each template “Bridge”, “Static”, “WANRIP”, “BothRIP” has appropriate user parameter set associated with modes and/or features, col.8: 34 - col.9: 6; and FIG. 6, block 114, specifying appropriate user parameter set based on profile management option from block 102, col.9: 7 - col.10: 54).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Vasamsetti's teaching into Horman's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so to ensure compatibility as suggested by Vasamsetti (e.g., col.10: 30-54).

Neither Horman nor Vasamsetti explicitly discloses *versions of user parameter sets*

However, in an analogous art, Miller further discloses *versions of user parameter sets* (e.g., FIG. 15, item 1514, [0126]; [0071]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Miller's teaching into Horman and Vasamsetti's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so to provide the ownership for the user parameter set and/or identify said user parameter set as suggested by Miller (e.g., [0071]).

Claim 26:

The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated. Horman also discloses *comprising a user parameter set* (e.g., col.2: 27-49).

Claim 27:

The rejection of claim 26 is incorporated. Horman also discloses *the parameterized command script template further comprises an associated version specification, and the user parameter set further comprises an associated version specification* (e.g., col.4: 44 – col.5: 2; col.18; col.7: 27-65).

Claim 28:

The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated. Horman also discloses *at least one command script template of a plurality of command script templates further comprises a script execution dependency specification specifying another command script derived from one other command script template to be submitted for prior execution* (e.g., col.18; col.25: 48 - col.28: 46).

Claim 29:

The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated. Horman also discloses *the at least one parameterized command script template is specified in accordance with one command interface language from:*

Command Line Interface (CLI), eXtensible Markup Language (XML) (e.g., col.6: 18-56),

Node Management Terminal Interface (NMTI), and Transaction Language 1 (TL1) (e.g., col.7: 27-65).

Claim 30:

Horman also discloses *a method of configuring communications network a managed entity comprising the steps of:*

selecting at least one parameterized script template from a plurality of parameterized script templates based on a configuration task to be performed on the managed entity (e.g., FIG.1, col.3: 6-38; col.2: 27-49);

populating the parameterized command script template with parameter set to derive a command script in respect of the configuration task (e.g., col.3: 53 – col.4: 57; col.8: 8-34); and

submitting the command script to the managed entity for execution (e.g., col.25: 48 – col.28: 46; col.8: 8-44),

user parameter set are used to populate the command script templates (e.g., col.3: 53 – col.4: 57; col.2: 27-49).

Horman does not explicitly disclose *a versioning module ensuring that appropriate user parameter set are used.*

However, in an analogous art, Vasamsetti further discloses *a versioning module ensuring that appropriate user parameter set are used* (e.g., FIG. 5 Network Profile Templates, which ensure each template “Bridge”, “Static”, “WANRIP”, “BothRIP” has appropriate user parameter set associated with modes and/or features, col.8: 34 - col.9: 6; and FIG. 6, block 114, specifying appropriate user parameter set based on profile management option from block 102, col.9: 7 - col.10: 54).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Vasamsetti’s teaching into Horman’s teaching. One would have been motivated to do so to ensure compatibility as suggested by Vasamsetti (e.g., col.10: 30-54).

Neither Horman nor Vasamsetti explicitly discloses *versions of user parameter sets*

However, in an analogous art, Miller further discloses *versions of user parameter sets* (e.g., FIG. 15, item 1514, [0126]; [0071]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Miller’s teaching into Horman and Vasamsetti’s teaching. One would have been motivated to do so to provide the ownership for the user parameter set and/or identify said user parameter set as suggested by Miller (e.g., [0071]).

Claim 31:

The rejection of claim 30 is incorporated. Horman also discloses *retrieving the at least one parameter value from a repository* (e.g., col.11: 27-65).

Claim 32:

The rejection of claim 31 is incorporated. Horman also discloses *retrieving the at least one parameter value from the repository the method further comprises a step of: retrieving a user parameter set including a plurality of user parameter values for the command script template* (e.g., col.2: 27-65; col.4: 44 – col.5: 2).

Claim 33:

The rejection of claim 32 is incorporated. Horman also discloses *populating the command script template further comprising step of:*

determining that a user parameter value is not provided in a user parameter set (e.g., col.5: 5-56); *and*

prompting a user to enter the missing user parameter value to populate the command script template (e.g., col.6: 18-56).

Claim 34:

The rejection of claim 33 is incorporated. Horman also discloses *storing a user parameter set version in a script repository* (e.g., col.1: 40 – col.2: 6).

Claim 35:

The rejection of claim 34 is incorporated. Horman also discloses:

each command script template has an associated version specification (e.g., col.8: 8-44),

in retrieving the user parameter sets, comparing the command script template version with the user parameter set version (e.g., col.11: 27-65); *and*

selectively re-entering a user parameter in the user parameter set if the user parameter has changed (e.g., col.10: 22-64).

Claim 36:

The rejection of claim 30s incorporated. Horman also discloses *populating the parameterized command script template with at least one network management system parameter value to derive a command script in respect of the configuration task (e.g., col.6: 18-56).*

Claim 37:

The rejection of claim 36s incorporated. Horman also discloses *retrieving a network management system parameter value (e.g., col.8: 56 – col.9: 48).*

Claim 38:

The rejection of claim 37s incorporated. Horman also discloses *requesting the network management system parameter value from one of a network management system and a network management system database (e.g., col.1: 40 – col.2: 6).*

Claim 39:

The rejection of claim 30s incorporated. Horman also discloses *retrieving the at least one selected command script template from a script repository (e.g., col.2: 27-65).*

Claim 40:

The rejection of claim 39 is incorporated. Horman also discloses *electing more than one command script template, the method further comprises the step of: generating an apply list of command scripts (e.g., col.4: 44 – col.4: 2).*

Claim 41:

The rejection of claim 40 is incorporated. Horman also discloses:

a command script template further includes a script execution dependency specification specifying command scripts required to be executed before the corresponding command script (e.g., col.5: 5-56),
ordering the plurality of command script templates in the apply list (e.g., col.6: 18-56).

Claim 42:

The rejection of claim 41 is incorporated. Horman also discloses:

determining that a script execution dependency specification specifies a command script not currently a member of the apply list (e.g., col.7: 27-65); and
retrieving the corresponding command script template from a script repository for inclusion in the apply list (e.g., col.8: 56 – col.9: 48).

Conclusion

9. Applicants' amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Thuy Dao (Twee), whose telephone/fax numbers are (571) 272 8570 and (571) 273 8570, respectively. The examiner can normally be reached on every Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday from 6:00AM to 6:00PM.

Art Unit: 2192

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam, can be reached at (571) 272 3695.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273 8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272 2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Thuy Dao/

Examiner, Art Unit 2192

/Tuan Q. Dam/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2192